

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 28-41 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS claims -29-35 and ADDS claims 36-41.

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claim 28 by the Examiner.

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner alleged that “an interpolation table” is not a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter. Although Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner’s allegation, Applicant has amended claim 35 to be in method format and substantially include the method steps recited in claim 28. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 35 should be allowable for at least the reasons that claim 28 is allowable because claim 35 substantially includes all of the method steps recited in allowed claim 28, with additional features and method steps directed to the interpolation techniques of the input and output points of the table. Support for the additional features and method steps recited in claim 35 can be found on, for example, page 10, line 3 through page 11, line 5 of Applicant’s originally filed specification. New claims 36-41 correspond to previously presented claims 29-34. Applicant respectfully submits that this Amendment should be entered because it complies with the Examiner’s requirements in the Final Rejection in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.116(b), and the Amendment could not have been previously presented.

Claims 29-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner alleged that claims 29-35 depend from canceled claim 1; in claim 29, line 2, that it is unclear as to which set of colorants the “undesired colorant” is eliminated from; and in claim 34, lines 3-4, that the term “said modified transformation” lacks proper antecedent basis.

Applicant notes that, in the Final Rejection dated June 2, 2008 and posted in IFW on July 21, 2008, the Examiner rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, but not claim 29. However, in the Final Rejection dated July 1, 2008 and

mailed on July 9, 2008, the Examiner rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, but not claim 34. Accordingly, Applicant has addressed both claims 29 and 34 in response to the outstanding Office Actions.

Claims 29-34 have been amended to depend from claim 28. Claim 35 has been amended to be in independent form, as addressed above.

Claim 29 has been further amended to clarify that the undesired colorant is eliminated from the transformed set of colorants.

Claim 34 has been amended to refer to "said modified colorant set," which is first recited in the third to last line in claim 28.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 29-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 28 and 35 are allowable. Claims 29-34 and 36-41 depend upon claims 28 and 35, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 28 and 35 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 9, 2008

/Stephen R. Funk #57,751/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200  
Reston, VA 20191  
Telephone: (571) 313-7440  
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Stephen R. Funk  
Registration No. 57,751